

**Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233**

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the NPRM), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

2008 MAR -3 P 2: 48

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Robert E. Cottrell

Signature

2-25-08

Date

ROBERT E. COTTRELL

Name

P.O. Box 155, ROSEDALE, IN 47874

Address

765 548 2155

Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

0

FILED/ACCEPTED

MAR 10 2008

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

**Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233**

MAR 10 2008

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.
- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Kenn Wissmüller

Signature

2/7/08

Date

Kenn Wissmüller

Name

3630 McLaughlin Dr. Saginaw MI.
Address

Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

**Comments in Response to FCC: Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233**

I have been in the radio industry for 30 years. I have many problems with respect to the Localism Proposed Rulemaking.

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present. What political issues will this **advisory board** impose on the on the broadcaster.

(2) The FCC **must not** turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any media.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially special programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of educational and religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many NEC broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Many NEC stations have spent thousands of dollars for unattended operation equipment as well as EAS Systems. The commission is relying on the latest technology for a new Digital EAS system. However it is not allowing the broadcast to use the same for unattended operation. This is very unfair to say the least. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

(6) The commission should force major operators to reduce the number of stations in a market. Force the major BIG Signal Stations to reduce operating power levels. This would allow more local stations to serve the market.

(7) I urge the FCC, Congress and the Senate not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Francis F Lapple

25, February, 2008
Date

Signature

Francis F. Lapple
Name

24 Maple Court
Bay Shore, NY 11706-8726
Address

631-968-6358
Phone

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed
Rulemaking MB Docket No 04-233

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL ACCEPTED
MAR 10 2008

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism
Notice of proposed Rulemaking (the NPRM) released Jan 24 2008
in MB docket NO 04-233

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First
Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM,
if enacted, would do so - and must not be adopted.

- (1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious
broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their
same values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would
impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters
who resist advice from those who don't share their values could
face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license
for choosing to follow their own consciences rather than
allowing, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape
their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government,
including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster,
particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.
- (2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public
forum where everyone and anyone has rights to airtime.
Proposed public access requirements would do so - even if
a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message.
The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery
mandates on any religion.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

- (3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency - and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.
- (4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically carried from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.
- (5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio locations choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.
- We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Bradley K. Smith
Bradley K. Smith

2/25/08
1200 Edgar Ave #A
Mattoon, IL 61938
(217) 273-6881

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

MAILED
FEB 29 2008
FCC Mail Room

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Katherine Stamps

Signature

Feb. 22, 2008
Date

Katherine Stamps

Name

401 Norwood Dr. #1
Address
Richmond, Ky 40475-1257

859-623-7508
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE